

REMARKS

We have carefully considered the Office Action dated May 1, 2007, in which claims 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and claims 1-21 are rejected as obvious over a combination of United States Patent 6,295,527 to McCormick et al. and United States Patent 6,098,067 to Erickson.

With respect to the objection to the specification, we point out that the specification on page 9 discusses selecting to include a computer in a group that is in a predetermined position on a list of groups that meet grouping criteria. In the example, the system assigns a computer to a group based on a first record in the list that meets both primary and secondary lower limit criteria. If, however, none of the records meet the secondary lower limit criteria, the system assigns the computer to a group based on the last record in the list. Thus, in the example the first predetermined position corresponds to the first record that meets both the primary and secondary lower limit criteria, and the second predetermined position corresponds to the last record on the list. In other situations, the system may, for example, select as the first predetermined position a different record that meets the primary and secondary lower limit criteria, such as, for example, the last record to do so, and so forth.

With respect to the § 101 rejections, we have amended claim 12 to clarify that the computer profile data in the database are manipulated and the results provided to a user in the form of reports. The clarification should put the claim in form to overcome the § 101 rejection.

With respect to the § 103 rejections, we point out that one of the operations in each of the independent claims is that of grouping the computers in manners that correspond to selected criteria. A second operation in each independent claim is that of manipulating the data from the database to produce reports that organize the data corresponding to the groups. The reports summarize the attributes of the computers in the groups, with each report for a given group including therein the attributes of the computers in the groups that are on a sub-tree with a given group as its root. The two operations together provide a method and system for managing a database to producing reports that organize the data in a manner that takes advantage of the groupings.

While the McCormick patent, as discussed in earlier remarks, teaches using multiple user-selected criteria to search for and retrieve desired information about respective computers from a database, there is no teaching in McCormick of organizing the results of the search by **providing reports that summarize the attributes of the computers in the groups and including in the report for a given group the attributes of the computers in the groups that are in the subtree that has the group as its root**. Indeed, as the Examiner points out, McCormick does not even teach or suggest grouping computers in a tree structure of groups. Rather, McCormick teaches displaying a list of the devices that meet the search criteria. See, Col. 14, lines 64-67; Col. 16, lines 17-34 and lines 35 et seq.

The Erickson patent, which describes a remote computer management system, does not add to the teachings of McCormick the missing **manipulation of data from the database to provide the reports that summarize the attributes of the computers in**

the groups, and including in the report for a given group the attributes of the computers in the groups that are in the subtree that has the group as its root. The Erickson system, which does not even include a database, provides a tool that helps the user write scripts. The tool presents to the user a "visualization" of how the scripts that are being written will run on the computers in the system. See, Fig. 5. The hierachal arrangement in Erickson is not based on grouping criteria that consists of computer profile data, but rather on finding computers with "like" conditions. See, Col. 7, lines 1 et seq.; Fig. 6 (compare box 603).

Also, while Erickson shows a hierarchical arrangement of computers, with each computer or group of computers represented as a node in the hierarchy, each node in the hierarchy "inherits the actions and variables of its hierarchical parent(s)." See, Col. 2, lines 5-7. Accordingly, Erickson teaches using the tree in an *opposite* direction than the current invention, to include in the computer management operations actions and variables inherited from computers higher in the hierarchy, that is, the actions and variables applicable to computers in a given group and also the computers in the parents of the group. See, Col. 2, lines 10-13.

Thus, even if a combination of Erickson and McCormick could be interpreted to somehow suggest producing reports that relate to the attributes of groups of computers, the combined teachings do not teach or suggest a system that produces reports that summarize the attributes of a given group and the groups that are on a subtree with the given group as its root.

The claims, as amended, should now be in form for allowance. We respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider his objections and rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patricia A. Sheehan/
Patricia A. Sheehan
Reg. No. 32,301
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500